

S/N 10/826,508

In Response to Office Action mailed February 23, 2005

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 1 is hereby amended.

The amendment of claim 1, reciting "wherein the bonding layer is useful for an adhesive layer to resin", is supported by page 2, lines 35-37, page 3, lines 13-15, and Figure 1.

Claims 1-11 were rejected as being indefinite. Claim 1 is amended to address the concerns of the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration of claims 1-11 is requested.

The Examiner cited Strobel (US 2003/0035976 A1) on the PTO-892 form. Applicants submit that this reference does not suggest a bonding structure, formed on a copper surface, the bonding layer comprising an alloy that has a thickness of not less than 0.001 μ m and not more than 1 μ m, which is useful for an adhesive layer to resin, as required by claim 1. Rather, Strobel teaches binary tin-silver coating that is applied to an electrode material, which is useful to obtain an improved electrical contact. Strobel teaches a coating having a thickness of 0.254 to 25.4 μ m (see claim 4), rather than 0.001 μ m to 1 μ m. Further, Strobel does not suggest a bonding layer formed on a copper surface, as required by claim 1. Rather, Strobel teaches an alloy being applied to a copper-tellurium alloy (see claim 14).

The Examiner cited Fujiwara (US 6,329,074 B1) on the PTO-892 form. Applicants submit that this reference does not suggest a bonding structure for bonding a resin comprising a bonding layer formed on a copper surface, wherein the bonding layer is useful for an adhesive layer to resin, as required by claim 1. Rather, Fujiwara teaches a rust inhibitor layer formed on the surface of a copper foil, and a chromate rust inhibitor layer formed thereon (see claim 1). Fujiwara does not suggest a resin layer being applied upon the chromate rust inhibitor layer. Even if a resin were provided on the chromate rust inhibitor layer, the rust inhibitor layer would not be considered by one knowledgeable in the art as useful for bonding resin. Further, Fujiwara does not suggest the specific composition ratios required by claim 1 of the current invention.

S/N 10/826,508

In Response to Office Action mailed February 23, 2005

The Examiner cited Carey (US 6,080,497 A) on the PTO-892 form. Applicants submit that this reference does not suggest a bonding layer useful for an adhesive layer to resin, as required by claim 1. Rather Carey teaches a coating for architectural materials, useful for durability and desirable colorization. Carey neither teaches nor suggests the alloy comprised of copper, tin, and a third metal, as required by claim 1. Bonding to resin is neither disclosed nor suggested.

The Examiner cited Carey (US 5,695,822) and Carey (US 5,667,849) on the PTO-892 form. Applicants submit that these references do not suggest the bonding layer comprised of copper, tin, and a third metal, and the composition ratio thereof, as required by claim 1. Bonding to resin is neither disclosed nor suggested.

The Examiner cited Schenzel (US 5,494,565 A) on the PTO-892 form. Applicants submit that this reference does not suggest the bonding layer comprised of copper, tin, and a third metal, and the composition ratio thereof, as required by claim 1. Rather, Schenzel teaches a copper-tin alloy and a wear-resistant layer, useful to obtain improved decorative properties. Bonding to resin is neither disclosed nor suggested.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612)455-3804.

Dated: May ²³~~19~~, 2005



DPM:mfe

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Douglas P. Mueller".

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No.: 30,300

Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 2650
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612.455.3800